

February 24, 1993 LB 138

start to fall off and you're going to see the new forms of gambling as they come on board pick up that slack because the growth in gambling is not going to be that great. It's going to...it's going to grow...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...but it is not going to be that great. And you don't even take into consideration the whole issue of what could happen in the area of Indian gaming and what could happen as it relates to not only this state but the state to the east when they look at bringing Indian gaming on board full line, they already have it there, but when they bring it on at every border crossing in this state, everyplace where the bridge goes over the Missouri River into Iowa and the dollars will flow more readily in that direction. I think it makes sense for us to put the state lottery in place today. I think it's probably ten years behind the curve. It always seems to be when we're dealing with gaming issues, but it's important as well to look at where we've been in the past, but I believe that at this point in time we need to put the lottery into effect. I would reject Senator Wesely's amendment, although I do appreciate the history lesson.

SPEAKER BAACK: Time. Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I didn't intend to speak on this issue but I was interested in the handout that Senator Wesely gave us showing the history of gambling in the state from 1934. And the thing that's interesting about it to me is that this Legislature apparently has never voted to expand gambling except in response to a constitutional amendment, that is except in response to the will of the people. That seems to be true all six times. There doesn't seem to be one legislative bill that was passed except in response to the will of the people. And so it seems clear to me that...that we're dealing with an issue where we need to do what our constituents want to do. I don't think that this can rise to the plane of a moral discussion because I think there are two different points of view as to what's moral and what's not moral and, obviously, the people of this state do not feel that gambling, the way we do it and under the controls that we have, is a moral issue. So I think it would be intolerably paternalistic of us in this particular circumstance to impose